

### REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action mailed October 4, 2005. In the office action the Examiner:

- allowed claims 11-14;
- objected to claim 8 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim;
- rejected claims 1-4, 7 and 15-20 as being anticipated by Koyama et al. (US 5,703,582);
- rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(s) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Gillig (US 5,604,468);
- rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. (US 5,812,572), as applied to claim 1 above; and
- rejected claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Bellaouar et al. (US 6,308,049).

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 1-3 and 5-23

### *Overview of Changes to Claims*

The limitation of claim 4 has been incorporated into claim 1. Claim 4 has, therefore, been cancelled. Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify that the current control signal is applied to transistors in the current mode driver. Support is found in Fig. 9A. Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to change step to operation and to clarify that the condition is a timing condition. Support is found in paragraph 148 of the specification. Claim 21 has been amended to define multi-PAM. Support is found in paragraph 61 of the specification. These amendments, therefore, do not constitute new matter.

### *35 USC 102 (b) Rejections*

In the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7 and 15-20 as being anticipated by Koyama et al. The Applicants disagree and traverse.

After entry of this reply, independent claim 1 includes the limitation of a current control signal that includes a plurality of bits. Koyama et al. does not teach or disclose this limitation. In the present Office Action, the Examiner refers to Fig. 6 of Koyama et al. as teaching this limitation (p. 3, lines 14-15). The Applicants note that Fig. 6 of Koyama et al. shows a plurality of *single bits* (D<sub>1</sub> through D<sub>255</sub>) that each drive one of the corresponding

constant current circuits L1 through L255 (Col. 2, lines 35-36). Furthermore, the D<sub>1</sub> through D<sub>255</sub> bits are the decoded data input to the DAC and are not current control signals for adjusting the full scale current of the DAC. This is in contrast with amended claims 1 and Fig. 9A of the present application. Since Koyama et al. does not teach all of the limitations of claim 1, it does not anticipate claim 1. Since dependent claims 2, 3 and 7 include the limitations of their parent claim, these claims are also not anticipated. Removal of this ground for rejection is requested.

In addition to the preceding argument, the Applicants also note that Koyama et al. does not teach or disclose the limitation of “applying a PVT independent current to a PVT sensitive load”, as claimed in claim 7. Therefore, Koyama et al. also does not anticipate claim 7 for this reason. Removal of this ground for rejection is requested.

Independent claim 15 includes the limitation of “applying the first output as a gate voltage to control a full scale current of an output driver.” Koyama et al. does not teach or disclose this limitation. In the present Office Action on p. 3, line 22-p. 4 line 1, the Examiner refers to “the first output (41) as a gate voltage (col. 8, lines 18-30) in Koyama et al. The Applicants note that that gate voltage shown in Fig. 1 and described in the specification (col. 8, lines 18-30) of Koyama et al. is the voltage on capacitor 35, i.e., the output of amplifier 34, not the voltage on the output terminal (41). This is in contrast with Fig. 21A and claim 15 of the present application. Since Koyama et al. does not teach all of the limitations of claim 15, it does not anticipate claim 15. Since dependent claims 16-20 include the limitations of their parent claim, these claims are also not anticipated. Removal of this ground for rejection is requested.

### *35 USC 103 (a) Rejections*

In the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 6 as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. in view of Gillig. The Applicants disagree and traverse.

In light of the preceding arguments, Koyama et al. does not teach or disclose all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Furthermore, Gillig does not teach or disclose the above discussed aspects of claim 1 that are not taught by Koyama et al. Since dependent claims 5 and 6 include the limitations of their parent claim, the combined teachings of Koyama et al.

and Gillig do not achieve all of the limitations of these claims. The cited combination, therefore, is not *prima facie* obvious. Removal of this ground for rejection is requested.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 9 and 10 as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. in view of King et al. The Applicants disagree and traverse.

In light of the preceding arguments, Koyama et al. does not teach or disclose all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Furthermore, King et al. does not teach or disclose the above discussed aspects of claim 1 that are not taught by Koyama et al. Since dependent claims 9 and 10 include the limitations of their parent claim, the combined teachings of Koyama et al. and King et al. do not achieve all of the limitations of these claims. The cited combination, therefore, is not *prima facie* obvious. Removal of this ground for rejection is requested.

In addition to the preceding argument, the Applicants also note that the cited combination does not teach or disclose the limitation of “sensing a PVT sensitive AC parameter” as claimed in claim 10. Therefore, the cited combination is also not *prima facie* obvious for this claim for this reason. Removal of this ground for rejection is requested.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 21-23 as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. in view of Bellaouar et al. The Applicants disagree and traverse.

In light of the preceding arguments, Koyama et al. does not teach or disclose all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Furthermore, Bellaouar et al. does not teach or disclose the above discussed aspects of claim 1 that are not taught by Koyama et al. Since dependent claims 21-23 include the limitations of their parent claim, the combined teachings of Koyama et al. and Bellaouar et al. do not achieve all of the limitations of these claims. The cited combination, therefore, is not *prima facie* obvious. Removal of this ground for rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-4000, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 6, 2006



Gary S. Williams

31,066  
(Reg. No.)

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

2 Palo Alto Square

3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700

Palo Alto, CA 94306

(650) 843-4000